



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,857	01/18/2002	Shigeo Kurose	OKA-0013/DIV	9953

23353 7590 03/06/2003

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

RESAN, STEVAN A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/050,857	KUROSE ET AL.
	Examiner Stevan A. Resan	Art Unit 1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5, 8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1773

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-4, 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Saitoh US 6127039 for the reasons of record.
3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saitoh as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Echigo et al 5,342,668 or Sato et al 4571362 for the reasons of record.
4. Applicant's arguments filed 10-16-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102 was improper since Saitoh did not disclose process limitations. However as previously pointed out process limitations carry no weight unless they can be shown to produce a patentably distinct article. Since they have not been shown to affect the structure of the article of Saitoh, Saito et al anticipates the rejected claims.

It has been held that where claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or in composition, a case of anticipation or a prima facie case of obviousness has been established and the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to show that prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristic of a claimed product whether the rejection is based upon "inherency" under 35 USC 102 or on "prima facie obviousness" under 35 USC 103 jointly or alternately. In re Best 562 F2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); In re

Art Unit: 1773

Ludke, 58 CCPA 1159,441 F 2d at 212-13, 169 USPQ 563 (1971); In re Brown, 59 CCPA 1036, 459 F. 2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (1972).

“ When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not”. In re Spada. 911 F2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ 2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicants arguments with respect to claim 8 are circuitous and does not present reasoning or evidence to overcome a rejection under 35 USC 103.

Note also that in claim Claim 1 the limitation is only that the binder is “ a radiation curing binder resin” and not one which “has been cured” let alone one that “has been cured by radiation”.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1773

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stevan A. Resan whose telephone number is (703) 308-4287. The examiner can normally be reached on Tues-Fri from 7:30AM to 6:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau, can be reached on (703) *308-2367. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7718



STEVAN A. RESAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER